

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 6 and 7 have been canceled. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-10 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-10 remain rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Seigo* (JP 09-281440). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite that the slit pitch is selected such that when the parallax optic is disposed between the display device and the viewing regions, the slit pitch is sufficiently less than twice a pitch in the row direction of the pixels, and when the display device is disposed between the parallax optic and the viewing regions, the slit pitch is sufficiently greater than twice a pitch in the row direction of the pixels. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 9, lines 7-19 and Fig. 5 of application as filed.

Accordingly, the amendment to claim 1 further clarifies how viewpoint correction is achieved. An advantage of the device according to claim 1 is that angular zones converge at a pre-defined plane. Thus, the viewpoint correction creates two separate images at the selected plane or viewing region. This is illustrated in Fig. 3 of the present application. The two images created by the viewpoint correction lie in the kite-shaped area shown in Fig. 3.

In contrast, the convergence images in *Seigo* only exist at the points of convergence 8 and 9, as can be seen in Fig. 2 of *Seigo*. *Seigo* simply does not teach or suggest the feature of selecting the slit pitch to be either sufficiently less or greater than twice the pitch of the pixels in order to provide viewpoint correction. In particular, *Seigo* only discloses that the pitch of the image barrier is selected to provide two separate views at points 8 and 9 of Fig. 2, but not that the slit pitch is

selected to be sufficiently less or greater than the pixel pitch to provide viewpoint correction.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is distinguishable over *Seigo*. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-10 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Kenneth W. Fafrak/

Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 50,689

DATE: February 16, 2010

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

yamap893amendment-OA-10-14-092